

**REMARKS**

In the Restriction requirement dated April 8, 2003, four species of the claimed invention are identified. Also, the Applicant is required under 35 U.S.C. §121 to elect a single disclosed species for prosecution on the merits to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable.

The Applicant hereby provisionally elects, with traverse, Species II for further prosecution on the merits. Claims 39-63 and 76-87 are readable upon Species II identified by the Examiner. It should be noted that although these claims are readable upon Species II, many of the same claims are also readable upon the other species identified by the Examiner. By way of example only, independent claims 39 and 47 are readable upon Species I, III, and IV of the present application. Several other claims of Species II are also readable upon Species I, III, and IV of the present application. Therefore, the Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the Restriction Requirement.

The Applicant respectfully submits that the restriction of the present application in the manner suggested by the Examiner (e.g., by the groups of figures as set forth on page 2 of the Office Action) does not clearly define identifiable inventions in the present application. For example, Species III and IV of the present invention are different views of the same embodiment of the present invention (see page 6, lines 3-6 of the present application as originally filed). Accordingly, it is not clear why Figure 16 is included in Species I and why Figure 16 is not included with Figures 17 and 18 in the same species. As another example, it is not clear what criteria was employed to group the various figures into the species identified by the Examiner. The Applicant therefore respectfully requests reconsideration of the Restriction Requirement and clarification regarding the manner in which species are identified in the Restriction Requirement.

The Applicant kindly requests that the Examiner telephone the attorneys of record in the event a telephone discussion would be helpful in advancing the prosecution of the present application.

Respectfully submitted,



Christopher B. Austin

Reg. No. 41,592

Michael Best & Friedrich LLP  
100 East Wisconsin Avenue  
Milwaukee, Wisconsin 53202-4108  
(414) 271-6560

X:\clientb\065379\9001\A0617891.1